## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

JONATHAN RIZZO,

Plaintiff,

-against-

NEW YORK STATE (DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS); JOHN DOE, Officer working extraction team on January 23, 2022, Upstate Correctional Facility, et al.,

Defendants.

22-CV-4088 (LTS) TRANSFER ORDER

LAURA TAYLOR SWAIN, Chief United States District Judge:

Plaintiff, who is currently incarcerated at Upstate Correctional Facility ("Upstate"), brings this *pro se* action alleging that four John Doe correction officers at Upstate used excessive force against him. Upstate is in Malone, Franklin County, New York, which is within the Northern District of New York. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 112(a).

For the following reasons, the Court transfers this action under 28 U.S.C. § 1406 to the United States District Court for the Northern District of New York.

## **DISCUSSION**

Under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b), a civil action may be brought in

a judicial district in which any defendant resides, if all defendants are residents of the State in which the district is located; (2) a judicial district in which a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim occurred, or a substantial part of property that is the subject of the action is situated; or (3) if there is no district in which an action may otherwise be brought as provided in this section, any judicial district in which any defendant is subject to the court's personal jurisdiction with respect to such action.

Under Section 1391(c), a "natural person" resides in the district where the person is domiciled, and an "entity with the capacity to sue and be sued" resides in any judicial district

where it is subject to personal jurisdiction with respect to the civil action in question. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1391(c)(1), (2).

Plaintiff alleges that Upstate correction officers used excessive force against him, causing him to suffer injuries. He does not plead the residence of any of these defendants, only asserting that the alleged events giving rise to his claims occurred at Upstate. Because Defendants are employed at Upstate, where the alleged events occurred, from the face of the complaint, it is clear that venue is not proper in this Court under Section 1391(b)(1), (2).

Under 28 U.S.C. § 1406, if a plaintiff files a case in the wrong venue, the Court "shall dismiss, or if it be in the interest of justice, transfer such case to any district or division in which it could have been brought." 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a). Plaintiff's claims arose in Franklin County, which is in the Northern District of New York. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 112(a). Accordingly, venue lies in the Northern District of New York, 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2), and in the interest of justice, the Court transfers this action to the United States District Court for the Northern District of New York, 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a).

## **CONCLUSION**

The Clerk of Court is directed to transfer this action to the United States District Court for the Northern District of New York. Whether Plaintiff should be permitted to proceed further

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Plaintiff also sues the New York State Department of Corrections and Community Supervision ("DOCCS"). As an arm of New York State, however, DOCCS is immune from suit for damages under the Eleventh Amendment to the United States Constitution. *Kentucky v. Graham*, 473 U.S. 159, 166 (1985). "An official arm of the state," such as DOCCS, "enjoys the same Eleventh Amendment immunity from suit in federal court as is enjoyed by the state itself." *Posr v. Court Officer Shield No. 207*, 180 F.3d 409, 414 (2d Cir. 1999). Thus, Plaintiff's naming DOCCS as a defendant does not affect this Court's finding that this District is not a proper venue for this suit.

without prepayment of fees is a determination to be made by the transferee court. A summons

shall not issue from this Court. This order closes this case.

The Court certifies, pursuant to 28 U.S.C § 1915(a)(3), that any appeal from this order

would not be taken in good faith, and therefore in forma pauperis status is denied for the purpose

of an appeal. See Coppedge v. United States, 369 U.S. 438, 444-45 (1962).

SO ORDERED.

Dated:

May 31, 2022

New York, New York

/s/ Laura Taylor Swain

LAURA TAYLOR SWAIN

Third States District Jude

Chief United States District Judge

3